



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,892	11/18/2003	Xihua Zhao	GP-302994	3686

7590 03/17/2006

KATHRYN A MARRA  
General Motors Corporation  
Legal Staff, Mail Code 482-C23-B21  
P.O. Box 300  
Detroit, MI 48265-3000

EXAMINER

WYSZOMIERSKI, GEORGE P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1742

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,892

Applicant(s)

ZHAO ET AL.

Examiner

George P. Wyszomierski

Art Unit

1742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/19/06 (Election).
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 and 14-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,8,10,11 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4,7 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/24/04.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1742

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-8 and 10-13 in the reply filed on January 19, 2006 is acknowledged.

2. Claims 3 and 10 are objected to because, in clause (f) of these claims, the examiner questions whether Applicant intended to recite materials containing Re (Rhenium), or did Applicant intend to recite some other element.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ashton (U.S. Patent 4,038,514).

Ashton discloses bringing two aluminum alloy workpieces into contact with each other, inserting a consumable electrode into a groove between the workpieces, and using an arc welding method to fusion bond the workpieces together (this method would inherently result in melting of a spot on the workpieces). With respect to step (C) of the instant claim, Ashton column 9, lines 65-68 states that the weld root area resulting from this process consists of fine equiaxed grains. With respect to the growth promotion substance, the examples of Ashton use 5183 or 5356 alloys as the electrode, and these alloys contain Al and Ti in accord with the instant claim. Thus, all aspects of the claimed invention are held to be fully met by Ashton.

Art Unit: 1742

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashton.

Ashton, discussed supra, does not disclose the particle (claims 1-3), powder (claims 5 and 13), or film (claims 6 and 11) limitations of the instant claims, i.e. does not disclose the physical structure of the grain structure promoting substance as recited in the instant claims. This is not seen as defining a patentable distinction between Ashton and the claimed invention because one of skill in the art would recognize that the effects achieved in the Ashton process (certain grain structure in welded aluminum materials) are a result of the compositions used and the effects of the welding process on those compositions. One skilled in the art would believe that these effects would occur regardless of the physical configuration of the welding substance, i.e. they are based primarily on composition and heat effects on the composition. Further, the electrode used in the prior art can be seen as nothing more than a large particle, and because the electrode lies against the workpieces to be welded, can be seen as a film as well. Thus, no patentable distinction is seen between the process as disclosed by Ashton and that presently claimed.

Art Unit: 1742

7. Claims 4, 7 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not disclose or suggest a process as claimed and which includes use of a material containing Na (claim 4), or applying a paste to a workpiece (claims 7 and 12).


8. The remainder of the art cited on the attached PTO-892 and 1449 forms is of interest. This art is held to be no more relevant to the claimed invention than the art as applied in the rejections, *supra*.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Wyszomierski whose telephone number is (571) 272-1252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King, can be reached on (571) 272-1244. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by facsimile must be directed to the central facsimile number, (571)-273-8300. This new Central FAX Number is the result of relocating the Central FAX server to the Office's Alexandria, Virginia campus.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GPW  
March 15, 2006

  
GEORGE WYSZOMIERSKI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1700